THE U.F.O. Investigator

FACTS ABOUT UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Published by the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena

Vol. IV, No. 10 February-March, 1969

CONDON REPORT REJECTIONS INCREASE

The effect of the Condon Report (CR), which peaked in 48 hours, is steadily diminishing as its serious flaws and evasion of thousands of factual reports are spotlighted by scientists, NICAP and the press.

The growth of public criticism, more rapid than many expected, is highly encouraging–especially since most of it is based on only partial disclosures of the errors and omissions. Here are a few of the dissent items (detailed on another page):

Dr. J. Allen Hynek, chief AF-UFO consultant for almost 20 years, criticizes the report, will publish his full objections in April .... Columnist Roscoe Drummond: "... too many unexplained UFOs ... to banish the subject ..." the El Paso *Times*, San Diego *Tribune*, Dayton *News*, Knoxville *Journal*, Chattanooga *Post* and other newspapers comment adversely, some with sharp attacks .... A number of private critics–including active and retired AF officers–have joined NICAP because they could not accept the report.

A complete factual rebuttal by NICAP, with the aid of scientists, is being prepared. Because of our wide knowledge of the Condon project, from months of close cooperation before its increasingly negative approach forced us to break off, this rebuttal is certain to have a powerful–and we believe devastating–impact.

In addition, NICAP is furnishing important evidence to certain influential groups and individuals preparing scientific critiques that also will deal a blow to Dr. Condon and the report.

We have already taken effective steps to offset the report. Copies secured before release date were intensively studied to spot all the defects. In a Washington press conference, NICAP officials, Dr. James McDonald and Dr. David Saunders (former CU project scientist) covered many flaws, receiving good national TV, radio and newspaper coverage, including a balanced account on the Huntley-Brinkley newscast.

Numerous other press, TV and radio interviews with NICAP representatives followed, in Washington and around the country. The Special January issue (Vol. IV, No. 9) was filled with specific analyses of CR claims and UFO evidence errors. (For new members, and others desiring to give it wider circulation, copies are available at $1.50, postpaid, two for $2.50.)

NICAP's most important activity now is the preparation of its full documented rebuttals, being prepared with the aid of advisers and outside scientists. Concentration on this scientific cooperation is vital, because the harmful effects of the Condon Report, unless fully offset, will be greatest in the scientific community. Since it carries the added endorsement of the National Academy of Sciences, it can unduly influence hundreds of uninformed scientists unless vigorous action is taken to alert them to the scientific defects in it.

Our final rebuttal is being prepared as proof of factual errors and serious omissions, for comparison with each aspect of the Condon Report. Although Condon's unwarranted attacks on NICAP should be answered–especially his ridicule of scientific and technical Subcommittee investigators– we shall avoid ridicule tactics.

Naturally, we cannot reveal the rebuttal's most significant points, but we believe it will be the most powerful and convincing document NICAP has ever published. We are convinced that this publication, combined with the other strong dissents now underway, will reverse the beliefs of most Americans who–unaware of the evidence–accepted the Condon Report.

FOUR UFOs PACE AIRCRAFT

Four oval-shaped UFOs, the size of large Air Force transports, were encountered over Florida last November by pilots of two Cessna aircraft. The 30-minute sighting, investigated by aerospace engineers of NICAP's Cape Kennedy Subcommittee, was one of numerous cases reported in the last few months–sightings in at least 14 states, the Gulf of Mexico, Australia and New Zealand.

About dusk, on Nov. 26, 1968, two flight instructors and two student pilots in Cessna 150 planes were flying between Winter Haven and Melbourne. The instructors were experienced flyers, each with approximately 4,000 hours pilot time.

The four UFOs, described as about the size of C-130 transports, were first noticed over Lake Cyprus, about 45 miles from Melbourne. They were flying in right echelon formation, some 2,000 yards to the right of the planes. They were traveling at about the speed of the Cessnas, at an estimated 1,500 feet altitude.

About 10 minutes after the initial observation, one of the white, oval objects descended to "near or on the ground" as the remaining UFOs continued to pace the planes. Approximately 10 miles from Melbourne, one of the pilots turned on his landing lights, executed a sharp right bank, and headed on a collision course with the objects.

"At this point," the Subcommittee reported, "the three objects changed formation to a vertical stack and sped upwards at a great speed until they were completely lost from view."

The UFOs' speeds were estimated in excess of 2,000 m.p.h.

Other characteristics of the reports during the past seven months include another plane-pacing; a car-pacing; frightened witnesses; E-M effects; light beam cases; an object seen near a power plant; UFOs that emitted sounds, other objects and flames; a landing; and physical evidence.

Additional witnesses include commercial pilots; police officers; a town mayor; a town marshal; newspaper reporters; school teachers; and shrimp boat crewmen.

Pilots View "Satellite" Objects

On August 22, 1968, two commercial pilots, Gordon Smith and Walter Gardin, were piloting a Piper Navajo charter flight about 130 miles east of Kalgoorlie, Australia. At 5:40 p.m., Gardin alerted Smith to a "white glow" approximately 15 miles ahead of the plane.

"Several smaller dish-like objects emerged from the large white object, then returned to the parent object," said Australian NICAP member Paul Norman.

For 20 minutes the UFO was kept in view at about 1,000 feet altitude, then "took off with the speed of a rocket."

Less than five days later, Kalgoorlie was again the scene of a UFO report.

Spotlight Illuminates Car

Shortly after midnight, August 27, 1968, John Stevens was driving near Kalgoorlie when a "weird light" lit up the interior of his car, according to the August 28 edition of the Perth (Australia) News.

(Continued on page 3)

THE UFO INVESTIGATOR

Published by
The National Investigations Committee
on Aerial Phenomena
1536 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Copyright, 1968, National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP)®. All rights reserved, except that up to 300 words may be quoted by daily and weekly newspapers, news-wire services and news broadcasters, provided NICAP® is credited. No material may be reprinted by any book or magazine publishers without written permission from NICAP®.
NICAP Editors: Maj. Donald E. Keyhoe, Director, and Gordon I. R. Lore, Jr., Assistant Director.
Trademark "NICAP" Registered

Board of Governors

Dr. Marcus Bach; theologian, author & playwright, Calif.; **Rev. Albert Baller**, Congregational Minister, Mass.; **Col. J. Bryan III**, USAFR (Ret.), writer-editor, former special ass't to Secretary of Air Force, Va.; **Col. Robert Emerson**, USAR, research chemist, head of testing labs, La.; **Mr. Dewey J. Fournet**, former USAF Intelligence Major, business analyst, La.; **Mr. J.B. Hartranft, Jr.**, pres., Aircraft Owners & Pilots Assoc., Wash., D.C.; **Dr. C.P. Olivier**, astronomer, pres., American Meteor Society, Pa.; **Dr. Bruce A. Rogers**, emeritus professor of engineering, Texas A & M, Ariz.

EDITORIAL

Two allegations against NICAP made by Dr. Edward U. Condon, and already widely repeated, require comment. On page 14 of the Colorado report (Bantam) he states, "NICAP . . . maintained a friendly relation . . . during about the first year, while warning its members to be on guard lest the project turn out to have been 'hired to whitewash the Air Force'. During this period NICAP made several efforts to influence the course of our study. When it became clear that these would fail, NICAP attacked the Colorado Project as 'biased' and therefore without merit."

The first charge is emphatically denied. Far from hinting that the project was an Air Force whitewash, NICAP welcomed it as "a new era of UFO research . . . . For the moment, at least, the UFO problem is in the hands of civilian scientists where it belongs. The anomaly of a military organization trying to cope with a world-wide scientific problem as if it were merely an Air Force public relations problem is, we hope, permanently at an end." (UFO Investigator, Vol. III, No. 10).

Some NICAP officials and members were not convinced an AF-financed and arranged project would be independent and impartial. But in spite of this, after discussions with Dr. Condon, Coordinator Robert J. Low and project scientists, we agreed to their requests for full cooperation, including NICAP evidence, in the hope that the project would be truly objective as pledged in the contract.

The NICAP editorial said further that NICAP's top priority would be to send the best available data on which the scientists could base a judgment. This promise we kept.

Over 1200 sighting reports were sent, background information was supplied, an Early Warning Net was established making use of our investigation network, and uncounted hours of work by NICAP staff members were devoted to help the project. In view of this, Dr. Condon's vague statement that we merely "maintained a friendly relation" does not do justice to the facts.

This support continued long after the first disturbing reports began to reach us, including the lack of objectivity clearly evident in Dr. Condon's repeated public statements. Repeatedly he evinced his fascination with the antics of UFO kookdom and his apparent lack of interest in hard-core case material of a substantial nature. Still NICAP felt—and stated—that the project staff as a whole was trying hard to do a good job.

Other reports were also reaching us, concerning the lack of field investigations and the dilatory character of the research.

Even when we became gravely disturbed by these trends and made a partial break with the project in September 1967, pending satisfactory answers to questions about what was being done with the NICAP cases and about future plans of the project, we continued to allow our Subcommittees to cooperate and left the door open for re-establishment of "friendly relations." This could have been done through written assurances from the project director that a vigorous, objective investigation would proceed and that NICAP's submitted evidence would not be ignored.

We still felt that perhaps these ominous trends could be reversed; and with so much at stake it was incumbent upon us not to condemn the project prematurely, before it was given every chance to carry out its stated mission of thorough and objective study. All the evidence in the pages of the UFO Investigator, on record for all to see, shows that we championed the project and defended it against its critics to the last possible moment. Only after the project, in effect, fell apart from within did we deem it a failure.

As to the second charge, that "NICAP made several efforts to influence the course of [the Colorado] study," we did indeed do this. We made repeated and continued efforts to influence the course of the study in the direction of objectivity, thoroughness, and concentration on the really significant reports. For these attempts, we make no apology.

It is also true that "when it became clear these efforts would fail," NICAP did end its cooperation and make public its disappointment in the project. We did so with great regret, after over a year of hard work on behalf of the project which put a severe strain on our finances, out of necessity and conviction. We could not have done otherwise in good conscience once it became evident that the project situation was beyond repair and foredoomed to be biased and superficial.

A complete written record as presented in the UFO Investigator and in correspondence with the Colorado Project staff will be set forth in a NICAP rebuttal paper on the Condon Report. It will prove that NICAP engaged in no such hypocritical tactics.

WORDS FOR THE AGES

In Section II on p. 28 of the Colorado Report (Bantam edition), after a discussion of the probability of visits to earth by extraterrestrials, Dr. Condon states: "In view of the foregoing, we consider it is safe to assume that no ILE [Intelligent Life Elsewhere] outside of our solar system has any possibility of visiting Earth in the next 10,000 years."

With these words Dr. Condon joins the group of renowned scientists who have made predictions about the "impossible" in science and technology. It is instructive to note a few of these predictions, and what happened to them.

Lord Kelvin, for decades the most eminent of British mathematicians and physicists, seems to hold the record for such pronouncements. In 1895, when the discovery of X-rays was announced, Lord Kelvin regarded the announcement as a hoax. In 1896 he stated that he "had not the slightest faith in aerial navigation other than balloons." And in 1897 he pronounced on radio; he saw no future for it, he said, except for communication with lightships or with other places where cables could not be used. (1824-1907)

1940's: "The A-bomb is the biggest fool thing we have ever done. . . The bomb will never go off. And I speak as an expert on explosives."—Admiral Wm. Leahy, Chief of Staff under Pres. Truman.

1945: "There has been a great deal said about a 3000-mile high-angle rocket" (the ICBM). "In my opinion, such a thing is not possible for many years. . . It will not be done for a very long period of time to come."—Vannevar Bush, WW II scientific adviser to the President.

Between these prophets and Dr. Condon there is one remarkable difference, however. *They* were predicting only what they considered impossible for *mankind* to achieve. He regards himself as even more omniscient; *he* feels qualified to predict what *non-human intelligence* will find impossible for the next 10,000 years.

Such examples of the clouded crystal ball have led another scientist, Arthur C. Clarke, to formulate what he calls "Clarke's Law": "When a distinguished . . . scientist states that something is possible, he is almost certainly right. When he states that something is impossible, he is very possibly wrong."

SIGHTINGS (Continued from page 1)

Stevens said he first noticed the object through his car's rear window. As he stopped the light vanished.

"I immediately got back in the car and went for my life," he reported. "As soon as I'd got started again the light came back on again right behind me."

The frightened witness accelerated, but the UFO continued pacing the automobile.

Stevens described the object as "two arms of light in a V-shape with a big central spotlight between them."

"I didn't believe in flying saucers before this," the observer stated, "but I'm not too sure now."

Other light beam cases were reported thousands of miles away, in the Gulf of Mexico and West Virginia.

In the following cases, all dates are 1968 unless otherwise noted.

Gulf Fishermen Also Report Light-Beam Case

On the evening of Nov. 22nd, the shrimp boat "Gulf Central" was searching for a missing vessel, the "Bobby Charles." The boat had been lost in the dense fog earlier that day, between Chandleur and Ship Islands, off Biloxi, Mississippi.

The "Central's" skipper was Preston L. Mallette. It was his son, Kenneth, who first sighted an object moving high in the south, coming "straight down."

The round object, estimated at 15 feet in diameter, had a flat top with a bulge on the bottom.

As the UFO headed down, it suddenly leveled off, executed a 45-degree turn and continued descending. Then the brightly-lit object sped toward the "Gulf Central."

"It came right on towards us," Kenneth Mallette stated, "and when it got right up over the boat it hesitated . . . and then went straight up out of sight."

The UFO also "threw a light on the boat like somebody was throwing a spotlight on us." It disappeared in less than a minute.

Other witnesses–most of them admittedly frightened–included William R. Mallette, the captain's brother, and the crews of other shrimp boats near Pascagoula and Chandeleur Island.

Light Beam Case in Ohio Valley

Residents in and around Point Pleasant, West Virginia, on the Ohio River, reported seeing a UFO between 10 and 11 p.m., September 16.

Mrs. Carolyn Skidmore and her family were driving home to Point Pleasant from Charleston when they saw an object with two red lights and one white light. They reported that it projected a light beam earthward. The object hovered at times and emitted "a low humming noise."

Mrs. Skidmore said the UFO was round, with a bright red top and a "tiny white light at the bottom." The light beam, she said, illuminated the hills in back of a junior high school. It disappeared near Point Pleasant.

Members of a society party, which included "three prominent couples," also saw the nocturnal craft, and the narrow, straight light beam.

Witnesses "Nearly Blinded"

Other witnesses included Celia Aeiker, reporter for the Point Pleasant Register, and her family, who watched from their home in nearby Henderson.

"It first appeared from behind a hill . . . ," Miss Aeiker wrote in a news story, "and then proceeded slowly across the river to Point Pleasant, returning a few minutes later, and then followed the same route again. A brilliant beam of light was projected from the bottom of the craft. The light was sweeping back and forth across the hillside, sometimes narrowing to a thin beam and other times spreading to cover a large area. At one point the beam was directed at us and we were nearly blinded by its intensity."

Reports that the object may have been a helicopter used to carry supplies to strike-bound personnel of the Philip Storm Plant were denied by a plant official.

Pilot Views Triangular Formation

At 4:10 a.m., November 29, commercial pilot Alan Harding and a passenger, Ramon G. Peddie, were flying in the vicinity of Mangamahu, Wanganui, New Zealand, when they saw three large, round, bright, pulsating UFOs in a triangular formation flying across the front of their aircraft toward the west.

"As we flew close to them they split formation and headed inland . . . at high speed," Peddie stated in his report to NICAP.

The objects crossed to a "big ridge."

"Then one descended below hill-top level, appearing to land," the pilot said.

The other two UFOs hovered above the hills. Then the objects "regrouped and disappeared."

UFO Emits Flames

Less than a month later a UFO frightened witnesses at a school in New Zealand.

A group of children, two teachers and a woman at an independent location in Havelock North saw a round UFO with a dome on top at 11:20 a.m., December 20.

The frightened students of Te Mata School said they saw a hatch and an antenna as the saucer hovered low over some poplar trees, according to the Hawke's Bay Herald-Tribune. One of the children, Gavin King, said there were lights rimming the underside of the object.

"Flames were coming out of the bottom and there was a bit of vapor," young King reported. "It was white on the bottom with a black band round the side. It made a clicking noise like a clock."

The students also reported a "diamond-shaped" light on the UFO's dome.

As the children drew their teacher's attention to the object, it "shot upward" and left a vapor trail.

Another teacher said he watched the strange craft for 10 minutes as it flew back and forth across nearby Hastings.

The woman at the separate location, Mrs. M. Berg Lipscombe, said she was watching from her yard and heard the object emit a "funny noise." As the UFO flew straight over her house, "it seemed to rev up all of a sudden and went straight up . . . ."

N.Y. Witnesses Describe E-M Effects

E-M effects were reported in one of a series of sightings in at least four counties surrounding the Elmira, N.Y., area, in late November. Observers, including police, described a UFO that frightened witnesses and caused an animal reaction, and an object that hovered near a power station.

At 6 p.m., November 25, Mrs. Elaine B. Peichy was driving her young son to her mother-in-law's home. They were on Route 174 near Marcellus, N.Y., when she saw five round, "red blinking lights . . . ."

"Then our car radio got very static," Mrs. Pelchy said in her report to NICAP.

The UFO appeared to follow the car, turned, and headed southeast about 100 feet in front of the vehicle.

"Then . . . our [dog] started crying, fighting, clawing first to get out the window, then in my lap, covering his eyes and ears, falling off the back seat . . ." Mrs. Pelchy related.

At this time, the car began "acting up like it no longer had power . . . ."

The UFO suddenly did a U-turn and sped back toward the northwest. As it turned, the lights changed to a blinking blue and white color. The blinking, the witness stated, resembled that of a neon light.

After leaving her son with her mother-in-law, Mrs. Pelchy was returning home by the same route when, she reported, her car once more began losing power and her dog again whined and barked.

Then she saw a huge light "the size of a basketball . . ." It was "blinding like a welding torch" with "fuzzy lights around it." The UFO she said, would "get brigher, then duller, then brighter, then blinding, etc., but it seemed to get smaller all the time." It was also moving in a circle, zig-zagging.

At 6:30 the following evening, Deputy Sheriff Alex Cole watched a UFO over Watkins Glen with the Robert Teed family, according to the Elmira Star-Gazette. Teed, who observed through binoculars, said the object had "changing lights of green, yellow, red and white."

"UFOs? YES!"

With this affirmative title, a vitally important new book has been published by New American Library authored by Dr. David R. Saunders, professor of psychology at the University of Colorado, and R. Roger Harkins, a Colorado newsman. The book's immediate significance is its relationship to the recently released report of the Air Force-sponsored University of Colorado UFO Project. However, the book also contributes other important insights into the UFO problem.

Dr. Saunders is one of the two scientists fired from the Colorado Project by Dr. E. U. Condon for alleged incompetence. This is his side of the story. As such, it contitutes a work that any fair-minded reader of the Condon Report must read. More than a personal recounting of his part in the project, the book furnishes important background information on how and why the study was undertaken in the first place, what some if its essential elements were, and why, in his view, it went wrong. In large part, it portrays personalities and how they clashed and what effects these clashes had on the inner workings of the Condon committee.

This background is distinctly relevant to the charges that have been made accusing the Project of having a strong negative bias on the UFO subject. Dr. Saunders' thesis is that these personalities, and biases, strongly influenced the final outcome.

Written before the project had run its course, the book does not pretend to cover the later period after Saunders was dismissed. (The firing came after Saunders was accused of giving the famous memo by Robert Low from "personal files" to outsiders, the story of which constitutes an interesting segment of the book).

"There is no doubt that the story of readjustments by the Committee and by the University, made necessary by Norm's and my discharge, would substantially strengthen the main thesis of this book. But this story can better be told by one of the survivors," Saunders says. (p.240, paperback).

In any event, the book supplies specific information clearly bearing on how the project was conducted, and why. For example, in Chapter 12 Saunders describes the details of certain sub-contracts, how much they were worth, and how they came about. Also given are specifics on his own computer studies, which were interrupted upon his dismissal. At the beginning of Chapter 15 the authors state, "Dr. Edward U. Condon had developed a case of psychoceramic (i.e., crackpot) itch and, to our growing dismay, he scratched it constantly." This preoccupation with crackpot and humorous but irrelevant stories was apparent to all who were in touch with the project, and is an important point to consider vis-a-vis the hundreds of substantial cases from credible witnesses that were ignored. This fascination, together with Dr. Condon's intemperate utterances to the press, caused the project many public relations headaches and created a serious "credibility gap."

Dr. Saunders' main conclusion concerning the Colorado Project is that, no matter what the final report says, "it will lack the essential ingredient of credibility." The book amply documents the reasons why little credibility is justified.

On UFOs themselves, Dr. Saunders objects to being labeled a "believer" or "quasi-believer." His thesis is that facts exist which appear to be important, and which need to be examined scientifically. The book is not so much concerned with specific cases as with the scientific controversy surrounding them. One case which he considers close to "airtight," among the so-called "classics," is the movie film taken in Great Falls, Montana, August 15, 1950. The report and film analysis are discussed at length (Chapters 8 & 9). His personal study of "orthoteny" (straight-line patterns of UFO sightings as expounded by Aime Michel) led him to conclude that, ". . . orthoteny is a fact and that the relationship of this fact to ETI [extraterrestrial intelligence] is a matter for further consideration in the context of other facts."

Dr. Saunders feels that, regardless of its essential failure, the project, in spite of itself, catalyzed "a few worthwhile things." Among these he numbers a new respectability for the scientific study of UFOs (this may not hold good any longer, in view of Dr. Condon's negative conclusions); the development of some useful techniques making UFO investigations more possible; and the discovery of some "highly remarkable facts" which constitute part of the UFO puzzle. (P. 237).

(UFOs? Yes! Signet paperback No. Q3754, New American Library, Box 2300, Grand Central Sta., N.Y.C. 10017 – 95¢).

FLAWS IN NAS REVIEW

The total approval of the negative Condon Report by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) has already started to backfire. Preliminary analyses by a few independent scientists and NICAP and some scientific-technical advisers have revealed serious errors of fact, significant omissions, and ignoring of even the most obvious contradictions.

This is an incredible performance for scientists usually considered as dedicated to seeking the truth.

We do not imply any agreement to rubber-stamp the Condon Report (CR). But NAS will inevitably be blamed for its strange handling of the report when all the facts are fully realized.

The NAS is a quasi-official agency established by Congress for "the furtherance of science and its use for the general welfare." By its charter, it provides consultations to any government agency which requests that NAS investigate and report on any subject of science or art, the actual expense to be paid by taxpayers' money, via Congress. Since NAS receives a large amount of its income from public funds, the public should be able to count on investigations and reports as complete and impartial as possible.

But in evaluating the Condon Report, the NAS scientific panel was seriously handicapped from the start. Its specific function was confined to reading the report and appraising it without a single outside investigation. Not one of the UFO cases presented by Condon was separately checked. Nor were any of the witnesses interviewed by the NAS scientists.

Panel Unfamiliar With UFO Problem

Another factor preventing a thorough CR review was the panel's unfortunate ignorance of the complex UFO problem. Even veteran NICAP staff members, with years of experience from investigating and evaluating thousands of UFO reports, have had to read and recheck the CR several times, to discover all the misleading claims and errors. To gain even a moderate working knowledge would have taken panel scientists a year's intensive study—and all they had was two weeks.

A good tip-off to the panel's scant UFO knowledge is its use of the phrase "occasional transient sightings . . . ." During the first four months of 1967 alone, the project logged 725 reports, about 45 a week. The project's computer print-out shows numerous sightings during this period lasting tens of minutes to over an hour. But the NAS evaluation gives a stereotyped view of UFOs as vaguely and briefly sighted and poorly reported.

Despite the scientists' lack of knowledge, it seems impossible that none of the panel was able to spot the unfounded "explanations," the evasions of massive evidence, the contradictions and the unwarranted ridicule of highly responsible and competent observers.

In regard to its conclusions, the panel seems to have had three main choices:

1. To accept the report fully, ignoring obvious errors.
2. To state frankly that they could reach no conclusion because of meager knowledge.
3. To reject the report, listing the contradictions, errors, omissions of massive evidence from World War II to 1966, and evidence of a negative approach.

Since some panel members were close friends of Condon, it has been suggested they would find it difficult to reject the report. It has also been suggested that some, if not all, sincerely believed UFO reports were nonsense and saw no reason to find fault with the CR.

Endorsement of Condon

Regardless of the cause, the panel highly praised the Condon study; said most field reports were hoaxes, or mistakes; accepted Condon's denial of secrecy without discussion; agreed that UFOs were no hazard, despite several pilot deaths following UFO chases, and numerous airline passenger injuries from pilots' hasty maneuvers to avoid hitting UFOs; and ignored serious factual testimony by well-informed scientists, including Air Force UFO consultant Dr. J. Allen Hynek and Dr. James E. McDonald, outstanding UFO authority.

The NAS said its sole purpose was to help the government decide regarding future UFO investigations. It would have been far more important to see that the government, Congress, the press and the public were given a fully detailed, impartial picture. A complete review would have included careful checking on project operations and a large cross-section of the strongest unexplained cases.

By its blanket approval of the Condon Report, the NAS has done a disservice to the public, to scientists in general, and to itself. We agree with Dr. McDonald and other scientists that the NAS will be seriously embarrassed when all the glaring flaws of the CR are revealed.

Library of Congress Exhibit

A display of UFO books and other material has been on exhibit for several weeks on the fifth floor of the Annex of the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

There are five cases and four wall displays. Included are sample issues of UFO publications (by no means complete) from the U.S. and other countries; some of the books on the subject; music about UFOs; a few photographs and cartoons; Congressional and official Air Force documents. Among the latter are complete copies of the Project Grudge report and of Report No. 14, but the copy of Project Sign report does not contain the appendices, consisting of NICAP case histories. NICAP's Grudge and Blue Book publication is shown. Both the three-volume typed edition of the Condon report and the Bantam edition are on display, along with Dr. Saunders' book about the Colorado Project. A mimeographed copy of the UFO bibliography compiled by the library is shown, with a statement that it will be published later in 1969 by the Superintendent of Documents.

Items omitted from the display indicate, however, that it was not assembled by someone conversant with the subject. Missing are some of the well-known UFO magazines; also missing are the books by Ruppelt and Tacker. Both of Vallee's books are shown, but only *The Interrupted Journey*, by Fuller, leaving out *Incident at Exeter*. Someone interested in UFOs and familiar with the field could have made a more significant selection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NEWS

The Nation's Capital, and a radius of about 50 miles into neighboring Maryland and Virginia, will be covered by an important new Subcommittee to be formally approved early in 1969. Because of its proximity to headquarters, the Capital Area NICAP Subcommittee will double as Advisers to the national staff. The unit includes experts in astronomy, physics, chemical analysis, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and opthalmology. Some local investigations have been conducted, and the cross-discipline group is developing careful guidelines for investigators which may form the basis for a new Subcommittee Handbook.

Europe No. 1 Subcommittee, in London, has a new Chairman, John Myers. He replaces Julian Hennessey who remains as an active member and Project Director of EURONET, a UFO reporting network of European airline pilots.

Reports reaching NICAP indicate some confusion about NICAP representation in the Rochester, N. Y. area. No Subcommittee has yet been approved for Rochester, and there never has been a unit there. Nearest Subcommittees are in Buffalo (James Sipprell, Chairman) and Syracuse (James C. Harris, Chairman).

NICAP wishes to thank the following Affiliate and Subcommittee personnel who have been forced to become inactive due to the pressures of personal affairs; they have made valuable contributions to NICAP, and continue their interest on a personal level:

Mickey Brookman, past president and a founder of NICAP's first Affiliate in New York City. (David Lieberman, Secretary-Treasurer, is in charge at present).

Jose A. Cecin, Chairman of New York No. 1 Subcommittee in New York City. (Cecin's credits include several important investigations and establishment of valuable contacts in South America).

A SCIENTIST'S CRITIQUE

BY DR. JAMES E. McDONALD

(Note: With Dr. McDonald's permission, we have excerpted the following remarks from his Feb. 12 talk to the DuPont Chapter of the Scientific Research Society of America, Wilmington, Del. Dr. McDonald is a senior physicist and professor of meteorology, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, University of Arizona).

SUMMARY - The Condon Report's negative conclusions and recommendations with respect to scientific study of UFOs are now a matter of public record. I dispute those conclusions, challenging and criticizing them on the following principal grounds:

1) The Report analyses only about ninety cases, a tiny fraction of the significant and scientifically puzzling UFO reports now on record.

2) It omits consideration of some of the most puzzling cases on record, famous cases that persons such as myself specifically urged the Condon Project to study. It even omits discussion of certain significant cases that Project staff actually investigated (*e.g.*, Levelland and Redlands).

3) Many of those cases which the Report does consider are of such trivially insignificant nature that they should have been ignored on the grounds that they are unrelated to the Project's prime mission, namely, seeking explanations of the kinds of truly baffling cases that have created the Air Force problem that led to establishment of the Colorado UFO Project.

4) Specious argumentation, and argumentation of scientifically very weak nature, abound in the Report's case-analyses. And, while broadly charging bias on the part of those who have taken the UFO problem seriously in the past, the Report exhibits degrees of bias in the opposite direction that deserve the sharpest of criticism.

5) To anyone intimately familiar with relevant report-details, some of the cases considered in the Report exhibit disturbingly incomplete presentation of relevant evidence; in a few instances, such defects seem little short of misrepresentation of case-information. However, I believe that the latter instances bespeak bias, not intent to deceive.

6) Despite all of the above, those who prepared the Report ended up with about a dozen (*i.e.*, about 15 per cent) of their cases in the *Unexplained* category. Some are extremely significant UFO cases (*e.g.*, Texas B-47 or Lakenheath); yet these Unexplained UFOs appear to have been casually ignored by Condon in recommending that UFOs be considered of no further scientific significance.

7) Irrelevant padding has thickened the report to a bulk that will discourage many scientists from studying it carefully. Detailed UFO report-analyses should have been the primary content of this Report, yet trivia and irrelevancies, or secondary material, are present in objectionably voluminous proportions.

8) The Report, it must be noted, does exhibit a few bright facets; but these are obscured by its high average defect-density.

9) In all, I believe that the contents of the Condon Report fail dismally to support the strong negative recommendations which Condon has presented in his own summary analysis. The strong endorsement by the National Academy of Sciences will, I believe, prove to be a painful embarrassment to the Academy, for it appears to be the epitome of superficial panel-evaluation by representatives of a scientific body that ought always to warrant the prestige its good name enjoys.

* * *

My own estimate is that absolutely no further general progress towards scientific clarification of the UFO problem will come until the inadequacies of the Condon Report are fully aired in as many ways as possible. I intend to devote all possible personal effort to that objective; and NICAP is in process of preparing an extended rebuttal report. So small a fraction of the scientific community is currently aware of the potential scientific importance of the UFO problem that this rebuttal will probably be slow in taking effect; but the Report seems so unrepresentative of good scientific work, so highly vulnerable to scientific criticism, that I believe its negative influence (except with respect to USAF decisions about Project Blue Book) will be quite short-lived.

CANADIAN PROJECTS

One official and one semi-official government project; the interest of various government agencies and Members of Parliament; and good sighting reports highlight past and present Canadian interest in UFOs. This information, now on public record, is an important part of the global UFO picture.

Dr. Peter Millman, head of the National Research Council's (NRC) Upper Atmosphere Research, has confirmed to NICAP reports that NRC was checking into high quality UFO reports. NRC's sighting files are open to public inspection, he added.

"There is no doubt at all that there are a few sightings that cannot be explained by our present knowledge of science," Dr. Millman told a reporter for the Toronto Daily Star.

Dr. Millman was also head of an early Canadian government investigation which held five meetings between April 1952 and March 1953. The minutes of Project Second Storey were classified "confidential" until April 1968.

Another member of the project was Wilbur B. Smith, electronics expert, broadcast monitoring official and authority on the ionosphere in the Department of Transport (DOT). In December 1950, Smith set up a semi-official unit called Project Magnet, aided by several scientists and engineers of DOT and other Canadian agencies. One of the project's efforts was an attempt to build a rotating disc to discover clues to UFO propulsion and control. The attempt was unsuccessful.

Early Sighting Reports

Among the good sighting reports left apparently unexplained by Smith were the following during the big 1952 "flap":

*–June 15, 1952. Halifax, Nova Scotia. A disc 100 feet in diameter was seen by a meteorological assistant at an estimated 5,000 to 8,000 feet altitude. The UFO ascended into some clouds at an approximate speed of "at least 800 m.p.h."

*–August 27, 1952. MacDonald, Manitoba. Two meteorological officers saw a disc "well below" 5,000 feet over MacDonald Airport. The UFO circled the field twice and, when struck by the airport's rotating beacon, "glinted like shiny aluminum" and disappeared toward the northeast "within a second."

*–December 27, 1952. Regina, Saskatchewan. At two separate times, a Regina Airport control tower officer, an Air Traffic controller and a meteorological officer saw a round UFO with a red flashing light on top and a green flashing light on the bottom that was "about the size of the full moon."

Also in the 1950s, Canada joined with the U.S. in developing the AVRO disc, an air-cushioned "saucer" that flew no more than a few feet off the ground.

Around 1954, said Canada's Defence Minister, Paul Hellyer, the government secretly designated the Defence Research Board Experimental Station at Suffield, Alberta, as a site to be available for possible UFO landings. Though no landings resulted, the act of official designation indicated that some fairly high officials did not scoff at the UFO extraterrestrial hypothesis. Hellyer also stated that, in 1967, Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) detachments were instructed to pass on UFO reports to the national defence department in Ottawa.

Parliament Members Urge Study

Various members of the Canadian Parliament have also taken an avid interest in the subject.

In a speech on the House of Commons floor on April 21, 1966, Mr. William Dean Howe said that UFO reports contain "too much unexplained evidence to ignore" and that "a climate should be created in which Canadians can report what they see without fear of ridicule." Mr. Howe also urged that the Canadian government fully investigate UFO reports.

During the same session, Leo Cadieux, Associate Minister of National Defence, said that he would do his "utmost to have initiated the inquiry requested by [Mr. Howe] . . . ."

One year later Parliament member E.R. Schreyer urged the government to turn over all its UFO information to the House of Commons for study.

In September, 1967, the University of Toronto's Institute for Aerospace Studies began its own investigation of UFO reports.

An early 1968 letter to a NICAP member from the Department of National Defence's Director of Information Services stated that "certain reports suggest that [UFOs] exhibit a unique scientific or advanced technology that could possibly contribute to scientific or technical research."

CAPSULE BOOK REVIEWS

Flying Saucers Are Hostile, by Brad Steiger and Joan Whitenour. (Award Books, 1967, 159 pp., 75¢).

Are the Invaders Coming? by Steve Tyler. (Tower Publications, 1968, 146 pp., 60¢).

The U.F.O. Report, by Irving A. Greenfield. (Lander Books, 1967, 141 pp., 60¢). Writing a UFO book from other UFO books is a popular pastime nowadays. There might even be a place for a good book of this kind for the reader whose interest has been recently aroused. Unfortunately, most of the cut-and-paste jobs tend to be inaccurate and undiscriminating, and some are so meagre in content that even their paperback price constitutes a fraud on the purchaser.

Each of the books above suffers to various degrees from the following faults: incorrect statements; failure to cite sources; over-interpretation of theories; and a failure to discriminate between dubious and well-authenticated reports.

The Steiger-Whitenour opus purports to prove the theory of the title, and the authors have assembled a motley array of stories in support. These range from mere UFO sightings, devoid of any signs of hostility or even danger, to a series of lurid incidents alleged to have occurred in Russia, published in an Italian magazine, and apparently accepted at face value by the authors.

Danger and damage from UFOs have been reliably reported in a very few cases compared to the total number of sightings. But to assert that these cases prove active, deliberate intent to injure is unwarranted. Car buzzings and plane pacings, however they may frighten witnesses, may represent nothing more than persistent curiosity by UFOs. Stretching such cases to include them under a sensational general hypothesis is not only ill-judged but mischievous.

The informed reader will also note that some cases are incompletely presented; Harry Sturtevant was *not* finally awarded workmen's compensation for injuries allegedly caused by a UFO, and Sharon Stull did *not* grow six inches in four weeks after seeing a UFO. Whether the authors knew these facts and preferred to offer the incorrect but more sensational versions is not clear.

Despite the publisher's sensational cover blurb, Mr. Tyler's book is calm and without exaggeration. The author's material is second-hand, and there are minor inaccuracies, but his approach is generally good and his comments sensible.

The only new material in Greenberg's work is a rather rambling account of his investigation of the 1966 sightings in eastern Long Island which covers the same ground as a more thorough inquiry by a NICAP Subcommittee. Similarly, the other events and ideas which he presents have all been described more completely elsewhere.

NOTE TO FOREIGN MEMBERS

A dock strike in the United States has prevented overseas surface mail from being delivered since the first of the year. You will not receive this issue until the strike is over and mail delivery returns to normal. If you ordered NICAP publications, they were unavoidably delayed because of the strike. We regret this situation. If you have not received special publications ordered from NICAP, they should be received shortly.

VOLUNTEERS NEEDED

NICAP headquarters is in need of volunteer office helpers. If you live in the Washington, D. C., area and can contribute some time weekly, please telephone us. Work must be done in the office, but evening and week-end hours can be arranged. Call 667-9434 and ask for Miss Davis.

SCIENTISTS RESPOND

An encouraging response from professional scientists, many critical of the conclusions of the Condon Report, has resulted from NICAP's effort to involve more scientists in evaluation of the UFO problem. Since the release of the Condon Report, the following have agreed to serve as NICAP Advisers:

Mr. Julius L. Benton, Jr. (M.S., Biology), Armstrong State College, Savannah, Ga.

Dr. William S. Bickel, physicist, University of Arizona.

Dr. Charles Gaston, space and atmospheric sciences, IBM, Wheaton, Md.

Dr. John P. Guarino, physical chemistry, Mobil Research and Dev. Corp., N.J.

Mr. Roger L. Guay, (M.S., Physics), infrared tech., Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash.

Dr. Darrell B. Harmon, Jr., Deputy Program Mgr., McDonnell-Douglas, Calif.

Mr. Alan C. Holt, experimental spec., NASA Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas.

Dr. Frank B. Salisbury, Head, Plant Science Dept., Utah State University.

Dr. Roger W. Westcott, Chairman, Dept. of Anthropology, Drew University, N.J.

Dr. Robert H. Williams, radiation chemistry, Mobil Research and Dev. Corp., N.J.

Dr. Norman S. Wolf, radiation biologist, University of Washington.

Madrid "UFO" Explained

The "mysterious" pyramid-shaped object seen by thousands over Madrid, Spain, last September 5th has been officially identified as a French meteorological balloon.

According to the Director of the Instituto de Meteorologia, the object which tied up Madrid traffic for more than one hour and which was pursued by Spanish F-104 jets up to 50,000 feet before they gave up the chase was an atmospheric probe launched at Landes in southern France.

Both this and another French balloon seen near Cuenca on September 7th received world-wide news coverage and speculation about extraterrestrial origins.

NICAP is glad to correct this erroneous report and any others where supposed UFOs are definitely proved to be conventional objects.

Two NICAP Advisers Die

NICAP regrets to report the recent death of Professor Jamison R. Harrison, a member of the National Panel of Special Advisers, Scientific Section, since early 1966.

Professor Harrison was an expert on radio communications. Throughout most of his academic career he was associated with Tufts College, where he started as an assistant professor of physics in 1930. From 1933 to 1936, he was also assistant dean of engineering. From 1936 through 1947 he was Head of the Department of Physics.

During World War II, Professor Harrison served as director of research on Piezo-Electricity for the U.S. Army Signal Corps at Tufts. In 1949, he was member of a National Research Council committee on undersea warfare.

After retiring in 1947, Professor Harrison continued his interests in science, as head of the physics department of Franklin Institute in Boston in 1954, and lecturer in physics at Fisher College 1956-59.

We are deeply grateful for the support he gave to NICAP.

We also regret to report the untimely death, in an automobile accident January 9, of NICAP Scientific Adviser Kenneth E. Bryan, Memphis, Tenn. Mr. Bryan, a meteorologist at Memphis Airport, served on the National Panel of Special Advisers. He had recently formed a Subcommittee (investigation unit) to cover the Memphis area. His loss will be keenly felt.

STRONG REACTIONS

Strong criticism of the Condon Report continues to pour into NICAP.

Preliminary statements from dissenting scientists have been made by Dr. J.E. McDonald, University of Arizona physicist (see separate story); Dr. J.A. Hynek, astronomer and Air Force UFO consultant; and scientists of the UFO Research Institute in Pittsburgh. The Detroit Free Press (2/14) quoted Dr. Hynek as saying the report was "not a thorough job . . . . I feel the report basically was too limited for the scope of the problem." Hynek announced that he would set forth his full objections in the April issue of "The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists." Speaking for the Pittsburgh group, which includes many scientists and engineers, aerospace scientist Stanton T. Friedman told the Pittsburgh Press (1/29) the Colorado study "was neither scientific nor primarily concerned with unidentifed flying objects."

Columnist Roscoe Drummond stated in the Christian Science Monitor that the Condon report was "inconclusive at significant points." Drummond said he is skeptical of UFO skeptics "who are determined to cast all doubt on all UFO sightings . . . . I find it hard to escape the conclusion that there are too many unexplained and presently unexplainable unidentified flying objects from too many credible and responsible witnesses to banish the subject from public concern." In an allusion to Dr. Condon's statement on the improbability of visits from space, Drummond mused, "Wonder what they thought about Jules Verne when 110 years ago he predicted that the time would come when three astronauts would take off from Florida for the moon. They probably said–not in 10,000 years!"

Newspapers Dissent

Numerous newspapers have strongly dissented. Sample reactions: columnist Sally Latham in the Chattanooga Post (1/14), "Well, I see Uncle Sammy has done it again–knitted us a $500,000 woolly eyeshade"; San Diego Tribune (1/14), "A two-year study of unidentified flying objects has yielded about what everyone expected–nothing . . . . The report acknowledged that some scientists preferred to keep an open mind on the matter. That might be a good attitude for laymen–believers and scoffers alike–to take as the flying saucer confrontation continues unabated."

Said the El Paso Times (1/9), "The Times will break down and admit that it is not completely convinced that there is no such thing as a UFO. There have been too many stories about them . . . to disregard the whole matter." Describing the main conclusions of the report, the Dayton, Ohio, Daily News said, "Now there's a report that invites more questions than it answers." "It took 54 years to advance from Kitty Hawk to Sputnik," observed Detroit Free Press columnist Boyce Rensberger (2/1), "but only another 11 years to Apollo 8. If in only 65 years man can progress from flying a few feet above the ground to flying a few miles above the moon, what will another 65 years bring? . . . Presumably, had Queen Isabella been more intelligent, she would have had not the slightest interest in financing an around-the-world voyage by three little ships."

Many dissenting letters have been coming in to NICAP. For instance, a retired Air Force Major, a pilot now employed by a top aerospace firm in St. Louis, wrote asking to form a NICAP Subcommittee. Other letters have followed the same general line as the following: "It took the Condon report to disturb me enough to get actively involved . . . ."

Technical journals have also commented. "Electronic Design" (2/1) quoted remarks by Congressman William F. Ryan (D-NY), who concluded that the government "has an obligation to continue to explore every facet of this problem until all the evidence–scientific and otherwise–is in." "Industrial Research" (Feb. '69) said further investigation of UFOs by the prestigious American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA) was still possible. The Chairman of the AIAA UFO Subcommittee (see previous issue), the magazine said, was located next door to Dr. Condon in Boulder but "there had been no exchange of information during the Condon study." The AIAA was reported to have "sentiment in the committee for open forums at future society meetings to debate the findings, or even a special UFO symposium."

A LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR

Dear NICAP Members:

The staff and I deeply appreciate your courageous reactions to Dr. Condon's negative report and his personal attacks on NICAP. Many of you who wrote or called were indignant, some were disgusted at the waste of taxpayers' money, others shrugged it off as just what they had expected–an all-out debunking which evaded most of the facts.

At first a few members admitted the highly publicized report was a jolt, increased by Condon's unwarranted ridicule of NICAP and myself, but most of them made a quick comeback. No one likes public ridicule, especially false claims. But anyone who expected us to fold up, defeated, is going to be seriously disappointed.

The attack on NICAP (despite earlier praise for our valuable help) was inevitable. We are the largest UFO fact-finding organization in the world and we have the evidence to disprove Condon's report. It will be a battle, but the facts are on our side, and the Condon Report is too vulnerable to stand up.

YOU can help win this fight. You can help offset the report by using NICAP rebuttal facts. You can show Investigator issues to local editors and newscasters, and also urge libraries to subscribe to the Investigator and spread the rebuttal wider. Factual letters to editors and local columnists often result in good publicity, also help to bring in new members.

You can also help in the search for good UFO reports which observers withhold for fear of ridicule. If you know any airline or military pilots, tower operators or other persons like to have had sightings–or to know of "hidden sightings–try to persuade them to report to NICAP. Tell them we will keep their names confidential if they request this, though we would like to release names.

If enough members attempt this, it will start a small stream of good reports that could soon become a flood. It is generally believed (by the AF, NICAP and even Condon) that 90% of U.S. sightings are never publicly reported. An outbreak of such reports by reliable witnesses would soon wreck the debunking and put the UFO problem, at last, on a serious nationwide level.

It is significant that recent UFO sightings are not being ignored by the press. The Associated Press, local papers and newscasters have publicized sightings in spite of Condon's denial of UFO reality.

(In this connection, please send us clips of editorials or UFO news stories, including dates and newspapers' names.)

We are sorry to take so much Investigator space in this issue, but it is imperative to circulate strong rebuttal material to Members of Congress, press-media and scientists who can aid us. However, in the future we shall condense CR items and print a larger amount of other material, including special features.

As we said in the last issue, the rebuttal operation will add heavily to NICAP's expenses. Unfortunately we are still suffering from the usual December slump which continued through January because the Condon Report forced a delay in mailing the Investigator. The Vol. IV, No. 9 issue, ready for the printer, had to be canceled and replaced with our preliminary CR review. The issue has brought a good response but not enough to cover bills incurred during the slump and set aside funds for preparing and publishing our major rebuttal.

The next few months will be most crucial. Dr. Condon and the AF went all out to bury the UFO subject–and NICAP. We have overwhelming evidence to neutralize the report. But it will be useless unless we can make this proof known nationwide–to Congress, the press and the public. We expect the first big impact not later than June, probably sooner.

Here is a partial list of estimated rebuttal expenses, also necessary routine operation costs through June: Preparation of the material, including pay for research-writer consultants, extra clerical help, long distance calls to scientists and other authorities aiding us, printing of the complete rebuttal, cost of a full-scale press conference at National Press Club, with several scientists supporting NICAP conclusions, and mailing of the rebuttal to all members of Congress, and over a thousand copies to press and broadcast media and specially influential citizens, $5900 to $6500. Cost of regular operations for 3½ months, through June: Three issues of the Investigator, including this one, and payment on back bill to printer; rent; reprinting of AF Projects Grudge and Blue Book Reports, balance on printing the NICAP "New Look" publication; regular telephone bills; janitor, miscellaneous printing (forms, order blanks, sighting forms, etc.); postage in addition to Investigator and rebuttal mailing; office supplies; Federal and D.C. taxes; payment of overdue bills incurred during the slump; steps required preparing the tax-exempt application - lawyer and auditor fees, travel and hotel expenses for Board members meeting in Washington (physical presence required in application procedure for discussion and approving current NICAP operations and application); salaries, equipment repairs, lease of Xerox and postage meter, and miscellaneous smaller expenses, $33,630. Total for rebuttal and regular costs, through June, $39,530.

If you can help us obtain this increased income, we shall publish the rebuttal as planned; if not, it will be delayed, though we shall get it out as soon as possible. Aside from the rebuttal we urgently need more income to cover regular operations and bills.

Opponents of our rebuttal plan would naturally like to see a long publishing delay–or for NICAP to give up hope and quit. I am certain NICAP members will never let this happen.

I hope that all those who can will do their best to help us in speeding up the rebuttal. You can help by ordering NICAP special publications (forms enclosed), by securing new members, or by contributions. I dislike to ask for donations but without them we could never survive.

The staff and I would like to give our heartfelt thanks to all our previous donors and to all of you who can help us in this critical period. The rewards will be high. This NICAP rebuttal will force a showdown and lead to the end of the long debunking.

Sincerely,
Major Donald E. Keyhoe, Director

BUYERS BEWARE

The Fieldcrest Publishing Co. of New York City has made an advance announcement of a book entitled *Confidential Report on UFOs*, by Maj. Donald E. Keyhoe. No such book, or any book, has been written by Maj. Keyhoe for Fieldcrest. This is probably a reissue of a 14-year-old Keyhoe book–*The Flying Saucer Conspiracy*, reprint rights for which were leased over Maj. Keyhoe's protests by Holt, Rinehart and Winston (HRW), who hold the copyright.

For some obscure reason, Fieldcrest also is announcing the late Capt. Edward J. Ruppelt's 1956 book, *The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects*, by the same new title, *Confidential Report on UFOs*. We hope no NICAP members will be misled into purchasing newly titled old books.

RATE INCREASE

Effective February 28, membership and renewal rate for all U.S. members is $8 per year (6 bi-monthly issues), $15 for two years.

Effective March 31, foreign membership and renewal rate for Canada & Mexico is $9 per year, $17 for two years; other foreign $10 per year, $19 for two years.

NICAP literature to prospective *new* members began reflecting the rate change February 1; however, current members were allowed additional time to renew at the old rate as announced in the last issue.

Affiliates, Subcommittees and Associate Members who have supplies of the old literature, please destroy them. Supplies of the new literature are being provided to active units; others will receive a supply on request.